

Saints from the nations of the earth is for a double purpose. One is, that the Saints may escape from the terrible judgments and calamities that are decreed to take place upon the nations of the earth. One of these calamities was to be the distress of nations, which will come in various ways. One will be by a general war of nations, which will result in other dreadful afflictions; such as famines, as the Lord prophesied in the Book of Mormon. These things are already beginning to take place, as all may know who but note the newspapers. It was but the year before last when 1,700,000 souls perished through famine in India, and now many millions of people in China are threatened with starvation.

Plagues and pestilences are among the judgments spoken of. The soil of these old countries not being able to sustain the increasing population, together with the loss of trade, which consequently brings depression, want and distress will result, and the people will rise up and call for bread. They will not be satisfied with a refusal while their wives and children are starving. Thus will be brought about a condition of affairs that is little thought of at present. This is one reason why the hundreds of shiploads of Saints are leaving these old countries for the land of Zion, where they are to-day in a greatly blessed and comparatively independent condition. Then there is another great reason why the Saints gather, and that is that they may escape from the wickedness and abominations that exist in these lands.

The voice of the Lord, according to the declaration of John the Revelator (xviii. 4), was to be sounded in the last days, in the ears of his people—"come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." This reminded the speaker of the reference made in the Scriptures to the fleeing of Lot from Sodom and Gomorrah, when the Lord called him to a place of safety, saying, "Flee ye to the mountains." Jesus said, "As it was in the days of Noah and Lot, so shall it be in the days of the coming of the Son of Man."

There is another important object had in view by the gathering of the

Saints of the Most High, and that is that they may be better taught in all things necessary to be fully prepared for the glorious day of the Lord's coming. The Saints gather that they may participate in the establishment of the "Lord's house," in the tops of the mountains, preparatory to the time when the words of Micah (iv.) shall be fulfilled, when many nations shall say, "Come and let us go up to the mountains of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." The people of the world will not all be converted; but the wicked will be swept away from the face of the earth, and there shall be no such thing as war, but will be a day of universal peace. The day will come when the wicked shall be utterly destroyed, "it shall leave them neither root nor branch." The flood literally destroyed all the wicked in the days of Noah, so will fire literally destroy all the wicked in the last days. "But unto you that fear my name shall the Son of Righteousness arise with healings in his wings, and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall" (Malachi iv. 2). How thankful we should be as Saints of the Most High, with these promises before us; and how diligent we should be to serve the Lord and keep all of his commandments.

The building of Temples is another incentive to the spirit of gathering, that the Saints may receive their blessings and also administer in the ordinances of the Gospel for the dead, that they (the dead) may have the opportunity of living "according to God in the Spirit," and being "judged according to men in the flesh." In this capacity of redeeming the dead, the words of the Prophet Obadiah will be fulfilled (21 verse), and "saviors shall come up on Mount Zion, to judge the Mount of Esau (the Gentile nations), and the kingdom shall be the Lords."

Singing. Benediction by President Budge.

Singing. Prayer by Elder W. N. Williams.

President Budge discoursed with freedom and power upon the first principles of the Gospel at some length. He was followed by

Elder Orson Pratt in a short, powerful and interesting sermon on the same subject. He showed the apostate condition of the world, notwithstanding their very pious professions of having possession of the Holy Ghost. He gave as a key to detect the impostures of the worldings, the words of Jesus: "These signs shall follow them that believe," etc., and demonstrated that if they had the Holy Spirit, the same glorious results and manifestations would follow, as did the bestowal of

that same Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

Benediction by President Parry.

The meetings were well attended throughout the day by the Saints, who had gathered from nearly all parts of the Conference. About 300 strangers attended and paid good attention. Much valuable and timely instruction was imparted by the speakers, and the day was one of great enjoyment to all lovers of truth who had the privilege of being present.

JOS. H. PARRY, Pres't.
W. N. WILLIAMS, Clerk.

POETRY.

THE VIOLET.

In lowly mood this flower appears,
Its silken stalk bears it not high;
No towering pride, nor loftiness,
To dazzle or allure the eye.

As conscious of its worth, it lies,
Nor clamors to be heard or seen
Like vulgar men, who wish to rise,
But silent keeps, like worth, I ween.

Though lone and lowly in its birth,
'Tis courted for its fragrance sweet,
By those who bend towards the earth
Its odoriferous breath to meet.

This floweret rivals e'en the sky;
Not nature boasts a fairer hue;
Content, unseen by mortal eye,
With beauty dimly seen in few.

Then who will now be boisterous, loud?
Or think it wise e'er to be so?
Are worth and beauty in the proud,
And not in those who seem so low?

Wise lesson teaches this sweet flower;
Conceited 'tis not good to be.
Its likeness I'll wear from this hour,
Sweet meekness and humility.

JOHN BATT.

DIED.

JAMES.—At Merthyr Tydfil, Jan. 17th, Margaret, wife of John James. Deceased was born in Merthyr, Dec. 20, 1836. She lived and died a faithful Latter-day Saint, beloved by all who knew her, and leaves a husband and four children to mourn her loss.—[Com.]

STEVENS.—At Ogden, Utah, December 28, 1878, Eliza Symons, wife of the late Jacob Stevens. Deceased embraced the Gospel in Bristol, England, and gathered to Utah in 1864. She was one of God's best children, a noble wife and mother.—"News."

JOHNSON.—At Eden, Weber County, Utah, December 17, 1878, of typhoid pneumonia, Peter Johnson, aged 46 years, 11 months and 17 days.—"Ogden Junction."

CONTENTS.

A Discourse by President Wm. Budge	49	Arrivals	58
The Book of Abraham—Its Genuineness Es-	53	Correspondence.—Letters from Elders D.	59
tablished	53	Murdock and Henry Flamm	61
Signs of the Times	55	Minutes of the Welsh Conference	61
Editorial.—Sacred Records	56	Poetry.—The Violet	64

LIVERPOOL:

[EDITED, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM BUDGE, 42, ISLINGTON,
LONDON

FOR SALE AT THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' BOOK DEPOT, 20, BISHOP'S GROVE, BALL'S
POND ROAD, ISLINGTON, AND BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS

MILLENNIAL STAR.

"HEAR THE WORD OF THE LORD, O YE NATIONS, AND DECLARE IT IN THE ISLES AFAR OFF, AND SAY, HE THAT SCATTERETH ISRAEL WILL GATHER HIM, AND KEEP HIM, AS A SHEPHERD DOTETH HIS FLOCK."—*Jeremiah xxxi, 10.*

No. 5, Vol. XLI.

Monday, February 3, 1879.

Price: One Penny.

THE BOOK OF ABRAHAM—ITS GENUINENESS ESTABLISHED.

BY ELDER GEORGE REYNOLDS.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 53.]

CHAP. V.

Gospel ideas believed in by the Ancients.

—*First departures from the True Faith.—The Egyptian Worship of Adam and the Patriarchs.—The book of the Dead.*

It is not difficult for those who believe in the Bible as it is written, to understand that immediately after the flood there was but one form of faith upon the earth, and that the true one. Noah was a preacher of righteousness both before and after the deluge, and because of their obedience to God's laws, he and his family were saved from the universal destruction that came upon the wicked. But their descendants in an early day began to depart from the purity of the truths that had saved "the fathers," and a knowledge of the forms of iniquity that existed among the antediluvians was in some manner conveyed to them, and incorporated in their debased new systems of worship. Noah, Melchize-

dek and others battled with but partial success against these growing infamies, and Abraham was especially called of the Lord to usher in a new dispensation. We have seen, in part, how he fulfilled this call; we shall now refer to some gospel ideas that for many centuries afterwards were found incorporated amongst the filth and rubbish of Paganism, some in Egypt, some in Persia, some in Chaldea, some in Greece, Rome, and other nations. From this almost universal admixture of the true and the false, it is evident that there was some primeval source from which the ancient gentile nations drew that which was good and true in their religions.

In our researches into the mythology of these peoples we find, amongst others, the following gospel ideas:

The belief in the existence of one great Father, God.

The prophecy and expectation of the coming of the Son of God in the flesh.

A reverence for Adam as the great

prince of his race, in some nations extended to his worship as the father of the terrestrial gods.

The belief in a resurrection, and in future rewards and punishments.

The necessity of faith in the gods, and under certain very remarkable circumstances, to be hereafter noticed, of repentance and baptism.

The administration of washings and anointings.

Traditions, more or less perfect, of the great war in heaven, when Lucifer and his angels were cast down upon the earth.

The belief in good and bad angels, ministers of the will of heaven.

A belief in the eternity of matter, and

The almost universal practice of sacrifice.

To give strength to the above assertions we shall now appeal to a number of well-known authors.

The Rev. Mr. Goodsir, in his work on *Ethnic Inspiration*, writes: "The principles of mythology enable us to discern the true order in which the various erroneous and morbid developments of human belief arose. It proves both, that Monotheism—the knowledge of the true God, preceded the various forms of polytheism, and especially the worship of the heavenly bodies; and that the worship of dead men preceded other forms of false or idolatrous worship; and the same facts which show that the worship of dead men was the first step in false religion, prove at the same time the original grafting of this on the belief of a heavenly Creator and Father. Were there no other than the single case of Egypt, as explained from its language, hieroglyphics and monuments by Mr. Osborn, it would place the matter beyond all doubt, so clear and well-supported is that case. Adam and Eve, Noah and Tamer, Ham, Mizraim* and Phut were all deified there, while the supreme God was incontrovertibly known; and the sun was only a symbol and the supposed abode of Adam. There is reason to believe that the state of things in Chaldea and Babylon was substantially the same as this."

* Mizraim is identified with Oairis, chief lord of the land of the departed.

To this we may append the remark that the Egyptians appear to have recognized the partial truth that there be those "that are called gods whether in heaven or on earth, as there be gods many and lords many," but were ignorant of the corollary, "but to us there is but one God the Father." (1 Cor. viii. 5, 6)

It must be evident from the light thrown on the early history of the world, more especially of Egypt, by the Book of Abraham, that under the almost universally existing form of patriarchal government "the fathers" were not only High Priests unto God by right of their "fatherhood, but also the kings of the earth by that same right, † and it was one of the easiest things in the world for the descendants of these men, who ruled by right divine, to not only reverence them as ministers of heaven's will in all things, temporal and spiritual, but also to deify and afterwards worship them. Indeed in the case of most of these holy patriarchs it was but a very small step in advance of their true position in relation to the sons of men; for "He called them Gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scriptures cannot be broken." (John x. 35.)

We next appeal to Mr. Osborn, author of "The Religions of the World." In writing of the Egyptian mythology, he states: "This most ancient mythology, as described by authors who lived before the Christian era, and as set forth on the walls of the temple in which its ritual or worship was performed, was taught to the initiated and concealed from the vulgar, that God created all things at the first, by the primary emanation from himself, his first born, who was the author and giver of all knowledge in heaven, and on earth, being at the same time the wisdom and the power of God. The birth of this all-powerful being, his manifestation as an infant, his nurture and education through all the succeeding periods of childhood and of boyhood, constituted the grand mystery of the entire system." So convinced were the priests of this people of the

† Max Muller says king originally meant "father."

coming of a Son of God, that they had chambers prepared in their temples for his nativity.

Another quotation from Mr. Osborn will, we trust, make the matter yet clearer to our readers. He says: "The founders of the nation knew not only of Ham and Mizraim, but of various men and women contemporary with them, even of our first parents Adam and Eve, as well as of our second progenitors, Noah, and his wife Tamar. Adam has thus been handed down to us as Athom, the guide or governor of the sun; Eve as Hathar, who presided over the moon; Noah as Nuh, who presided over the Nile; while Ham, Mizraim, Phut, Neveth, or Neith, the wife of Ham, and others, occupied singular or sometimes multiform positions and offices in the Egyptian Pantheon."†

We will now leave modern writers, and draw attention to that wonderful papyrus, the Ancient Egyptian Ritual or Book of the Dead, and from its hieroglyphics show the relation in which Adam stood in their mythology, reminding our readers that the abode of the great father of humanity, was supposed by them to be the sun, and that the chief seat of his worship was at Heliopolis, the city of the Sun, the On of the Scriptures. Aseaniath, a daughter of one of whose priests was married to Joseph, the son of Jacob.

Our extracts are necessarily brief, and simply intended to prove the trustworthiness of the quotations already made.

† "Religions of the World."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE REYNOLDS' POLYGAMY CASE.

TEXT OF RULING ON THE MAIN QUESTION.

Washington, Jan. 10.

A decision was rendered in the United States Supreme Court on Monday, and briefly reported, in the case of the polygamist George Reynolds, against the United States, brought here by appeal from the Supreme Court of

In the fifteenth chapter, it is written: "The praise of Athom §, when, the sets from the land of life, saith the Osir, ||

Glory be to Athom, setting from the gate of life, and when he to glory set, at

When his colors glow in the western gate of the horizon,

Hail to thee setting from the land of life,

Thou father of the Gods."

Again (chap. xvii.) Adam is represented as saying:

"I am the great god, creating myself;

I am the great Phoenix which is in On;

I am the creator of beings and existences."

In another place it proclaims:

"Glory be to thee, O Sun; glory be to thee, O Athom.

When thou goest down, perfect, crowned and glorious."

Adam is also called "the old man whose palace is at On," the "god alone in the firmament," "Father Athom," "Righteous Athom," and much more. Probably were we better versed in the mysteries of its hieroglyphics and idioms, the translation of this wonderful testimony to the belief of the ancients in the immortality of the soul, which this ritual is, would be yet plainer and more instructive. As it is, much of its imagery is very difficult for modern minds to grasp.

§ The Egyptian form of the name Adam.

|| The deceased.

the Territory of Utah. The following, with some unimportant exceptions, is the full text of the opinion of this court, delivered by Chief Justice Waite:

So far as it relates to the prisoner's plea of religious belief, and to the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit polygamy in the territories, the

question raised whether religious belief can be accepted as justification of an overt act made criminal by the law of the land, the inquiry is not as to the power of Congress to prescribe criminal laws for the territories, but as to the guilt of one who knowingly violates a law, which has been properly enacted, by entertaining a religious belief that the law is wrong. Congress cannot pass a law for the government of the territories which shall prohibit the free exercise of religion. The first amendment to the Constitution expressly forbids such legislation. Religious freedom is guaranteed everywhere throughout the dominion of the United States, so far as Congressional interference is concerned. The question to be determined is whether the law now under consideration comes within this prohibition. The word "religion" is not defined in the Constitution. We must go elsewhere, therefore, to ascertain its meaning, and nowhere more appropriately, we think, than to the history of the times in the midst of which the provision was adopted. The precise point of inquiry is, What is the religious freedom that has been guaranteed? In the preamble of the act introduced in the Virginia house of delegates, by Jefferson, in 1775, religious freedom is defined, and after reciting "That to suffer a civil magistrate to intrude his power into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on the supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty." It is declared "That it is time enough, for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when the principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order." In these two sentences is found the true distinction between what properly belongs to the church and what to the state.

In a little more than a year after the passage of this statute, the convention met which prepared the Constitution of the United States. Five of the States, while adopting a Constitution, proposed amendment. Three, New Hampshire, New York, and Virginia included, in one form or another, in the declaration of religious freedom

changes they desired to have made, as did also North Carolina, where the convention at first declined to ratify the Constitution until the proposed amendments were acted upon. Accordingly, at the first session of the first Congress, the amendment now under consideration was proposed, with others, by Mr. Madison. It met the views of the advocates of religious freedom and was adopted. Jefferson afterwards, in reply to an address to him by a committee of the Danbury Baptist Association, took occasion to say: "Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes an account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach the action only and not the opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence the act of the whole American people, which declared that their legislature should make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state. Adhering to the expression of the supreme will of the nation, in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction, the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore man to all his natural rights in opposition to his social duties." Coming as this does from an acknowledged leader of the advocates of the measure, it may be accepted almost as an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the amendment thus secured.

Congress was deprived of all legislative power over mere opinion, but was left free to reach actions which were in violation of social duties or subversive of good order. From that day to this we think it may safely be said that there has never been a time, in any State of the Union, when polygamy has not been an offence against society, cognizable by the civil courts and punishable with more or less severity. In the face of all this evidence it is impossible to believe that the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom was intended to prohibit legislation in respect to this most important element of social life—marriage: while, from its very nature, it is a sacred obliga-

tion; it is, nevertheless, in most civilized nations, a civil contract, and is usually regulated by law. Upon it society may be said to be built, and out of its fruits spring social relations and social obligations, and duties with which government is necessarily required to deal. In fact, according as monogamous or polygamous marriages are allowed, do we find principles on which the government of the people, to greater or less extent, rests. An exceptional colony of polygamists, under exceptional leaders, may sometimes exist for a time without appearing to disturb the social condition of the people who surround it, but there cannot be a doubt that unless restricted by some form of constitution, it is within the legitimate scope of the power of every civil government to determine whether polygamy or monogamy shall be the law of social life under its domain.

In our opinion the statute immediately under consideration is within the legislative power of Congress. It is constitutional and valid as prescribing the rule of action for all those residing in the territories, and in places over which the United States has exclusive control. This being so, the only question which remains is, Whether those who make polygamy part of their religion are excepted from the operation of the statute. If they are, then those who do not make polygamy part of their religious belief may be found guilty and punished, while those who do, must be acquitted and go free. This would be introducing a new element into criminal laws. Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one religiously believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of his religious worship, would it be seriously

contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent the sacrifice? or, if a wife religiously believed that it was her duty to burn herself upon the funeral pile of her dead husband, would it be beyond the power of the civil government to prevent her carrying her belief into practice? So here, a society, under the exclusive dominion of the United States, prescribes as a law of its organization that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the doctrines of religious belief superior to the laws of the land, and, in effect, to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself.

Government could exist only in name under such circumstances. Criminal intent is the necessary element of crime, but every man is presumed to intend the necessary and legitimate consequences of what he knowingly does. Here the accused knew he had been once married, and that his first wife was living. He also knew that his second marriage was forbidden by law. When, therefore, he married a second time, he is presumed to have intended to break the law, and the breaking of the law is a crime. Every act necessary to constitute crime was knowingly done, and crime was, therefore, knowingly committed. Ignorance of the fact may sometimes be taken as evidence of want of criminal intent, but not ignorance of the law. The only defence of the accused in this case is his belief that the law ought not to have been enacted. It matters not that his belief was part of his religion, it was still belief, and belief only. Upon careful consideration of the whole case, we are satisfied that no error was committed by the court below, and its judgment is consequently affirmed.

THE HOLY PRIESTHOOD.

BY ELDER JOS. HYRUM PARRY.

Much has been and still might be said upon this interesting subject. It has engaged the attention of the in-

spired men of all ages of the world; and as it is one which has much to do with our happiness and welfare, the

better the subject is understood by mankind, the better prepared they will be to enter into that perfect state, when the Father's will shall be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven. Before that day shall come, the human family will have to become perfect in the knowledge of the prerogatives and obligations of the Holy Priesthood, and their relations thereto.

Directly speaking, the Priesthood is the delegated authority of God; and it is the only legitimate power whose right it is to govern and direct the affairs of mankind upon the earth, both temporal and spiritual. In conferring his Priesthood upon chosen individuals, God bestows upon them authority to act in his name; not only to administer the ordinances of the Gospel to their fellow-men, but also to direct the affairs of his kingdom, and all things relating to it, and its members, as they, the Priesthood, may be inspired by the Spirit of the Lord.

In the righteous performance of their duties, the administrations of the servants of God are of just so much validity and force, as if the Lord ministered upon the earth in person. He upholds his Priesthood, and will sustain them in the faithful performance of their several duties. Whenever they baptize a sincere convert his sins are forgiven, because this is the significance of that sacred ordinance; it is performed in the name of the Lord, and the rite is accepted of him. The laying on of hands by the Priesthood, after baptism, for the reception of the Holy Ghost, is followed by the bestowal of the spirit of truth, the "Comforter," upon the penitent believer; and this because God has authorized his servants to act in his name.

When Jesus was on the earth he laid his hands upon and healed the sick. He afterwards called upon his Apostles to attend to this ordinance, where there were any sick, and they were healed. This gift and power to heal the sick, rests with the Priesthood of every dispensation of the Gospel, including this last; and the sick are as effectually healed as in former days.

We cannot place too much consequence upon the administrations of the Priesthood of God. They are his

ministers, the bearers of his authority and power to the nations of the earth. No man can disregard the counsels or administrations of the servants of the Lord without incurring his just displeasure; and he who opposes them, resists him who sent them. We might name numerous instances where a course of opposition pursued towards the Lord's work, has brought utter destruction upon the wicked; and those who have openly rebelled against his authority, have met with a similar fate.

The Priesthood was restored to the earth in this last dispensation of the Gospel, through the ministrations of angels from heaven. John the Baptist came and, laying his hands upon the Prophet Joseph Smith, ordained him to the Aaronic Priesthood. Afterwards, the ancient Apostles, Peter, James and John, the last who held the keys of the apostleship on the earth, came and conferred upon him that office and ministry. He, acting as the Prophet and mouthpiece of God, called others by revelation, and ordained them in like manner as he had been set apart, by the laying on of hands. Paul writes (Heb. v. 4.), that "no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." For the manner of Aaron's calling, see Ex. xxviii. It is only by direct revelation then, that a man can become an authorized bearer of the Gospel to mankind. Men who have thus been set apart, go forth with power and authority; with unequivocal teachings. They act in their calling as directed by inspiration, and the Lord confirms their administrations; or, to use his own words: "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

There is yet a very vital point to be considered in connection with this important subject, that should be conceded and well understood by the people; and that is, the right of the Priesthood to direct in all so-called temporal matters. We assert that the Lord has the absolute right to rule us in all things. Is he not our Father and God? He created this earth and placed us here to be subject unto him. We hold nothing here that we can call our own. We are but stewards, servants; who then should direct us but our Master

and God? What then is the manner and nature of his government? His properly constituted Priesthood and authority; it holds the keys of the government of the affairs of the human family. Aside from this authority, the people of God cannot be made one; neither approximate to that perfection so essential to eternal salvation. Before the kingdom of God is fully established upon the earth, every member of that kingdom will be willing to be directed by the inspired counsels

of the servants of God; and, instead of striving for selfish interests, "will seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." Thus will be brought about the Millennial reign of happiness and peace; the earth will be filled with the love of God, every one seeking the welfare and happiness of his neighbor. When this is consummated, the Priesthood will bear away over the whole earth, and the Lord's will be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven.

VARIETIES.

—o—

A little girl saw an old drunken man lying on a doorstep, the perspiration pouring off his face and a crowd of children preparing to make fun of him. She took her little apron and wiped his face, and then looked up pitifully to the rest and made this remark: "Oh, don't hurt him! He is somebody's grandpa."

In alluding to the poverty stricken condition of scores of thousands of the working classes, the "Christian Herald" says:

"A painful evidence of the wide-spread distress which at present exists, not only in the country but London itself, is afforded by the poverty-stricken crowds which besieged the premises of the Tower Hamlets Mission in the Mile End Road, London, on an intimation that a piece of dry bread and cup of cocoa would be given to every applicant. Last week, on Wednesday evening, between 500 and 600 men, women, and children gathered in front of the mission premises, some of them neat and clean, though obviously poor—many dirty, ragged, and repulsive. Young mothers were there with infants in arms, and older matrons with squalid children at their feet. The great proportion of the visitors—at least ten to one—were men, of whom many wore no shirts, and probably not one had such a thing as a collar. For the most part they had the look of men dispirited by compulsory idleness, and strangers to a substantial meal. One mechanic said he had been idle for ten weeks, and he added, "there are plenty more of us." The crowd was as dense as at the door of a theatre, but an almost absolute silence prevailed. A weight as of lead, seemed to hang on every head, and gaiety would have seemed as much out of place as at a funeral.

RULES FOR HOME EDUCATION.—The following rules are worthy of being printed in letters of gold and placed in a conspicuous place of every household;—

1. From your children's earliest infancy inculcate the necessity of an instant obedience.
2. Unite firmness with gentleness. Let your children always understand that you mean what you say.
3. Never promise them anything unless you are quite sure you can give them what you say.
4. If you tell a little child to do something, show him, how to do it, and see that it is done.
5. Always punish your children for wilfully disobeying you, but never punish them in anger.
6. Never let them perceive that they vex you, or make you lose your self-command.
7. If they give way to petulance or ill temper, wait till they are calm and then gently reason with them on the impropriety of their conduct.
8. Remember that a little present punishment when the occasion arises is much more effectual than the threatening of a greater punishment, should the fault be renewed.
9. Never give your children anything because they cry for it.
10. On no account allow them to do at one time what you have forbidden, under the same circumstances, at another.
11. Teach them that the only sure and easy way to appear good is to be good.
12. Accustom them to make their little recitals with perfect truth.
13. Never allow of tale-bearing.
14. Teach them self-denial, not self-indulgence of an angry and resentful spirit.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1879.

THE ANTI-POLYGAMY DECISION.

IN this number of the STAR, we publish the text of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Reynolds Test Polygamy Case, so far as relates to the main point at issue—the constitutionality of the anti-polygamy law, passed by Congress, in 1862. Our reasons for its publication are that our readers may have a clearer understanding of the important question with which it deals, and that it may be handed down, upon the pages of this journal, as a significant incident in the history of the momentous times in which we live.

The document under consideration purports to be the combined opinions of the judges of the Supreme Court. Officially expressed views from that source assume the form of final decisions upon all questions presented before it for adjudication. Being human, they are liable to err in judgment as well as to be swayed from the God-like path of truth and even-handed justice by ulterior considerations. Into one or other of those deplorable sloughs have they fallen in the present instance. Charity would suggest that their decision be viewed as an error in judgment, but justice and truth silence the intimation by asserting that their action was at the sacrifice of those heaven-born principles, and the product of base cowardice, from pandering to popular anti-Mormon fanaticism.

The decision bears the unmistakable marks of irreconcilable incongruity, as it will be an easy matter for us to show. We take our stand upon the question by assuming the correctness of the plea of the prisoner, that, in view of his religious belief in the doctrine of polygamy, Congress had no power to legislate to proscribe him in the free exercise of his conscientious convictions. Wonderful, and correspondingly inconsistent as it may seem, the document, in the whole of the first paragraph, fully and clearly sustains this position. Let the reader carefully peruse the sentences defining constitutional prohibition against Congressional interference with the freedom of religious exercise, and he will see this at a glance.

The learned judges have to travel backward a hundred years to find the definition of "religion." The quotations from the preamble of the act introduced into the Virginia house of delegates are singularly favorable to the position of Brother Reynolds. The supposition of the ill tendency of religious doctrines is not admitted as an excuse for the interference of the civil power.

According to this view, legislative interference with polygamy cannot be based upon the flimsy pretext of the "ill tendency" or supposed evil effects of that doctrine. As the second quotation puts it, "it is time enough, for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when the principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order."

Now, the law of 1862 simply and solely makes the ceremony, or act of marrying, a crime. Is there any "breaking out of overt acts against peace and good order" for two or more persons to quietly meet, all parties being agreeable, and, without noise or disturbance in the slightest degree, enter into a religious contract for time and eternity? It must be admitted that there is not. Well, it may be objected, subsequent ills may grow out of this act. But the citations of the astute judges frown down civil interference with acts because of their "supposed ill tendency." The acts of themselves must be breaches of good order to produce the admissibility of civil interference. So far, although the decision is adverse to the plea of the prisoner, its reasoning fully sustains it.

Why should the learned court, however, go so far back for a sensible definition of "religion," a matter with which any school boy is familiar. Doubt in the judicial brain upon that point might have been summarily silenced by recourse to any reliable dictionary. But props to sustain a tottering cause have frequently to be brought from long distances. If "religion" as an element of the Constitution, requires a separate definition from that which is generally understood and applied, wipe the word out altogether from the sacred document, that its language may be without ambiguity. Webster says, "Religion, in a comprehensive sense, includes a belief in the being and perfections of God, in the revelation of His will to man, and man's obligation to obey His commands." The "free exercise of religion," as expressed in the Constitution, means freedom to keep the "commands" of God, or it means nothing. Who does not know that exercise signifies action, or practice? The Latter-day Saints have received a commandment from God, directing them to embrace, in faith and practice, the Bible doctrine of plural marriage. The Court, or any other power may say, "we do not believe it." What of it? Religious obligation is a matter resting between man and his God, not between man and his fellow.

Even the quotation from the address of Jefferson is not happy as a steadying beam to the unconstitutional decision. There are, doubtless, acts that might be done in the name of religion that would be subject to legislative interference, but they must be "overt acts against peace and good order," and the quiet, unostentatious, peaceable act of going through the ceremony of marriage, against which the law of 1862 is solely aimed, cannot, by any consistent process, be placed in that category. Human law, so far as civilized and supposed Christian nations is concerned, is claimed to be based upon the Mosaic or Biblical code, included in which is compulsory polygamy, wherein a man was required to marry the wife of his deceased brother, providing he died without issue. This obligation was none the less imperative if the remaining brother already had a wife living. Not only is the act of marrying a plural wife not a breach of peace and good order, against which the law is directed, but the Latter-day Saints are acknowledged, even by some of their most pre-

judiced opponents, to be the most peaceable, long-suffering and industrious people on the Continent of America. Polygamy being entirely outside the category of disorderly and disturbing acts, and being a religious ordinance, Congress has no more right to interfere with its practice than it has to seek to abolish, legislatively, the practice of the ordinance of baptism, partaking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, kneeling in supplication to the throne of Jehovah, all these being in the nature of "overt acts," but not breaches of peace and good order.

The announcement that "Congress was deprived of all legislative power over mere opinion," sounds like the twaddle of imbecility. It is unworthy the high source from whence it emanated. It is tantamount to saying that Congress was deprived of doing what, under any circumstances, is an absolute impossibility. How could Congress legislate against "mere opinion?" If even Congress should be inclined to legislate against certain mental conditions, by what process would that body, or the officers of the government, ascertain what a man's opinions were, if he did not choose to express them. And if he did speak, frequent instances occur where uttered expressions are at positive variance with genuine sentiments, of which well known fact we take the Supreme Court decision as a striking example.

To assert that the intent of the religious freedom clause in the Constitution was to deprive Congress of all legislative power over "mere opinion," is equal to accusing the framers of that instrument of semi-idiotcy. As well might there be a constitutional provision, the object of which would be to prohibit Congress from legislating to prevent the sun from shining. Or, taking another view, such an assumption would make it appear that the Constitution had been framed to meet the probable contingency of Congress being composed, at some time in the history of the country, of a combination of lunatics. Surely it will be admitted that no body of men, mentally sound, would ever attempt to legislate against "mere opinion," it being self-evident that such legislation must remain forever inoperative. Its application would be a physical impossibility.

But, just listen to the learned opinion. It admits that under certain conditions a colony may practice polygamy without appearing to disturb surrounding monogamist communities. "But there cannot be a doubt that, unless restricted by some form of Constitution, it is within the legitimate scope of every civil government to determine whether polygamy or monogamy shall be the law of social life under its domain." The decision itself has already, in opposition to its own purport, shown the existence of such constitutional restriction. It has also shown that religious principles or their practice cannot be legally restricted because of their supposed "ill tendency," and yet the Court asserts that polygamy can exist among a people without injury to surrounding people, who may be averse to such a social system. What a strange mass of contradictions is presented in this judicial decision. It really appears as if the Court had lost its reason. The jumbled character of the document can only be accounted for on the ground of the difficulties in the way of bolstering a bad cause which has no foundation in truth or justice.

In further support of the decision the court asks whether, on the ground of religious belief, if a person should resort to the practise of human sacrifice, the

civil government would not be justified in adopting restrictive measures. Most decidedly it would, because such actions, religious or otherwise, are "subversive of peace and good order." They interfere with the rights of others, while plural marriage does not. The only answer necessary to this question is that the Latter-day Saints do not practice human sacrifice, and therefore the comparison has no more reference to them nor their religion, than it has to the religion, if he have any, of the honorable Chief Justice who strung together, in a sadly uneven and unattractive fashion, a number of illogical propositions, which, in nearly every instance, tend to demolish the position which, by them, he intended to sustain. The document is not only deficient in logic, but is even lacking in the element of ingenuity. We know that the task of giving an appearance of truth to a palpable error is irksome and difficult, but we certainly should have expected something less weak and inconsistent from the highest, and supposedly most learned and cultured Court in America, than the decision under consideration.

Unless the executive clemency of the President of the United States is exercised in his behalf, in view of the case being a test one, it is not improbable that Brother George Reynolds will have to go to prison, if, indeed, he has not been already conveyed there. This contingency we would deeply regret. We know him well, as a conscientious and consistent Latter-day Saint and, consequently, as an honorable, upright citizen. In the event of having executed upon him the sentence of the Court in which he was convicted, he will have the united sympathy of the whole people of God, and the consolation of suffering imprisonment in a noble cause.

EX-CHIEF JUSTICE MCKEAN DEAD.

THE Utah papers announce the death, at Salt Lake City, on Jan. 5th, of the notorious James B. McKean, Ex-Chief Justice of Utah, who assumed the duties of that office in July, 1870. On account of his being imbued with a spirit of the most bitter and relentless prejudice against the Latter-day Saints, and taking upon himself the self-imposed mission of demolishing the religious system of that people, he was named by many, the mission jurist. He openly announced his determination to put an extinguisher upon "Mormonism," by asserting, in Court, when the late President Young was arraigned before him on a trumped up charge, that "The case at bar is not the People of the U. S., etc., vs. Brigham Young, its other and more proper name being, the People of the U. S., etc., vs. Polygamic Theocracy."

So determined and unrelenting was his opposition to and prejudice against the Saints and their religion that he ignored many of the plainest laws, twisted and turned others from their real intent, as best suited the carrying out of his oppressive and unjust designs. Many of the brethren were arrested on indictments found by his packed grand juries and held in bonds or imprisonment. Happily a case was taken on appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court, which decided that the McKean crusade jury system was illegal, the business for two years, of the Third District Court, over which he presided, was nullified, and the brethren set at liberty.

With the determined pertinacity for which he was conspicuous, he continued his illegal and oppressive course. In the suit of Ann Eliza Young, *vs.* Brigham Young, he made a most outrageous decision in favor of the plaintiff, giving enormous and unparalleled alimony. The defendant was not allowed to appeal, and, declining to comply with the illegal order of the Court, McKean sentenced him to imprisonment for twenty-four hours in the penitentiary. The writer well remembers the feeling that was created in the community by this act. It was not only condemned by the Saints, but by almost every intelligent outsider. President Young was conveyed to the prison, about five miles distant from the city, in the evening, which was stormy, being in the winter. Fearing that he might meet with foul play, and being determined that he should not meet with a similar fate to that of the Prophet Joseph Smith, at the hands of his enemies, the brethren flocked from every quarter to the neighborhood of the building, a living stream flowing in that direction till near midnight, until several hundred men were in the vicinity. Guards were organized and stationed at every point, so that no one could either approach or leave the penitentiary.

Instead of this outrage securing for him the applause of the country, as he doubtless anticipated, it proved his downfall. He was everywhere denounced as a religious bigot, and President Grant removed him from office, in March, 1875, on the ground of his manifestations of "fanaticism on the bench." To add to his discomfiture, the Supreme Court of the Territory decided against the jury system he inaugurated and conducted during the last half of his official career, thus rendering the whole of his judicial business transacted during another two years a nullity. He remained in Salt Lake City, practising before the Court over which he had ruled with a high and tyrannical hand. He had a very limited practise, and was dispirited and disappointed. He was a strong Methodist. He showed no signs, so far as we are aware, of relenting towards the Saints or the Gospel, but was shorn of his power to inflict any injury upon them. He adds another to the long list of many who have lifted their puny power against the chariot of God's eternal kingdom, and who, instead of succeeding in their unrighteous designs, have brought their own utter discomfiture and overthrow. It is a somewhat striking incident that his death occurred only the day before the rendering of the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in the Reynold's case, over which, had he been alive, there can be but little doubt, he would have greatly exulted.

Aside from his prejudice against, and unjust and oppressive course toward the Saints, the deceased had the reputation of exhibiting some admirable traits of character in private life. In penning the foregoing brief and necessarily incomplete sketch, we have not been animated by a spirit of antagonism. We could wish that the truth admitted of our giving him a fairer record. We make the statement of his unjust acts and oppressive spirit, however, in the face of the absurd general custom of fishing around for highly colored and glossy details of a favorable character, which are too often substituted for facts in relation to deceased persons who have made blots on the escutcheon of time. We had frequent opportunities of witnessing the acts of the late James B. McKean, having had numerous occasions, in a professional capacity, in connection with the press, of visiting the Court over which he presided. It is to be hoped he will at some time, in the eternity into which he is launched, repent and turn from the error of his ways.

THE BOOK OF MORMON.—Elder Orson Pratt, having completed arrangements with printing and electrotyping establishments in London, for procuring plates of the proposed new edition of the Book of Mormon, with references, is now in that city attending to that important business. Elder Joseph Bull, sen., who has lately been engaged in the printing department of this office, in which he rendered most valuable service, has also gone to London, to assist Elder Pratt in his labors.

APPOINTMENTS.—The following missionaries from Utah, have been appointed Traveling Elders in the Conferences mentioned in connection with their names :

George H. Taylor, in the London Conference.
 Henry Rampton, in the London Conference.
 E. M. Curtis, in the Birmingham Conference.
 E. E. Brain, in the Manchester Conference.
 Hugh Watson, in the Manchester Conference.
 George Crane, in the Newcastle and Durham Conference.
 John F. Miller, in the Nottingham Conference.
 Joseph R. Matthews, in the Welsh Conference.
 Hyrum Bennion, in the Bristol Conference.
 W. Haigh, in the Liverpool Conference.
 Archibald Buchannan, in the Liverpool Conference.

DEPARTURE.—On Saturday, February 1st, Elder Joseph Hyrum Parry, having been released, left Liverpool on the *Guion S. S. Wyoming*, en route for the Southern States of America, where he will spend a few months before returning to his home in Utah.

Elder Parry arrived in this country on the 9th of August, 1877, and from that time until the appointment recently of his successor, he presided over the Welsh Conference, in which position he labored with much diligence and ability. He was lately appointed to labor in the printing department of this office, but, owing to the publication of the new edition of the Book of Mormon being conducted in London, instead of in this Office, as at first anticipated, his services in that capacity were not required.

In addition to the mission that Elder Parry has just filled in this country, he spent two years, from Sep. 1874 to June 28th, 1876, preaching the Gospel in England. For a young man his experience as a minister of the Gospel has been quite extensive.

We wish him a pleasant journey, and an agreeable sojourn in the States.

NOTICE.—In consequence of the publication of the new edition of the Book of Mormon being conducted in London, instead of at this Office, as formerly expected, Elder Joseph Bull, jun., will continue his labors in the Sheffield Conference.

"JUVENILE INSTRUCTOR"—We have received the last number of volume thirteen of this most excellent journal, published at Salt Lake City, by Elder Geo. Q. Cannon. Its pages are always filled with the most reliable, instructive, interesting and well-written matter. It has a large number of contributors, giving it that spicy variety so attractive to the general reader.

It is a periodical in which we have always taken a deep interest, on account of its usefulness as an educator of the youth. The mind of the writer is instinctively carried back a period of something over twelve years, when the *Instructor* was in its infancy. At that time, then a comparative stranger in Utah, so far as the country was concerned, although acquainted with a number of her people, we traveled through the Territory, north as far as Cache County, and south into Sanpete County, in the interest of the paper, advocating its claims to